



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/620,664	07/15/2003		David T. Margulies	HSJ920030168US1	HSJ920030168US1 4827	
44425	7590	03/08/2005		EXA	EXAMINER	
THOMAS I			FABE	FABER, ALAN		
18938 CONGRESS JUNCTION COURT SARATOGA, CA 95070				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2651		

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/620,664	MARGULIES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alan Faber	2651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/15/6	<u>03,11/25/03</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2,3,5 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	lrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	, , , , ,	` '				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents.	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da	PTO-413)				
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/15/03.		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/620,664 Page 2

Art Unit: 2651

The IDS has been considered.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the missing serial number on page 1 must be supplied.

Appropriate correction is required.

- 3. Claims 2,3,5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

The citizenship of the fourth inventor is unclear in the declaration of 11/25/03.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2651

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of copending Application No. 10/620,542. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is the obvious method of the apparatus of Serial No. 10/620,542.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claim 4 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of copending Application No. 10/620,542 in view of US 2002/0192506, hereinafter "Coffey". Claim 14 shows the claimed invention except for a laser heater. However, such techniques are well known. For example, see element 206 of Coffey. The motivation for combining references can be found at the abstract of Coffey. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify claim 14, as taught by Coffey, to increase recording density.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/620,664 Page 4

Art Unit: 2651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan Faber whose telephone number is (703) 308-4816. The examiner can normally be reached on flextime (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (703) 308-4825. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alan Faber Brimany Evan

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2651
